

September 4, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 8277

against the Pentagon in Washington some months ago. They were also those who had organized the Columbia University takeover. They were those who occupied New York's Grand Central Station for two and a half hours last March . . .

Among the groups here were the Students for a Democratic Society, the Radical Organizing Committee, Clergy and Laymen concerned against Vietnam, the Youth International Party . . .

Their favorite word for police is "pigs". This was the favorite chant that went up during the day and night, "Pigs, Pigs, Pigs." Politicians and public officials also are "pigs."

For two weeks before the convention they had made no attempt to conceal plans to disrupt, if they could, the convention procedures and the convention itself. Some of the Vietnam peace group members were in the Amphitheater itself, and at times, delayed proceedings by chanting, "Go home, go home" and "We want Gene . . . We want Gene."

Joseph Kraft made the following comment in his column of September 1:

The violence that scarred the Democratic convention here is too serious a matter to be muddled by loose talk about a police state and Gestapo tactics . . .

The police state analogy is misleading because what happened here does not fit at all into the classic pattern of official repression of the democratic process. That process was in fact going forward, no more imperfectly than usual, inside the convention. The demonstrators outside, by their vicious language and provocative acts, were trying to obstruct it.

If the matter is to be reviewed, all the facts should be placed upon the table. In this way, we can act soberly and responsibly without emotion or prejudice to avoid, if we can, a recurrence of these disorders, but meet them firmly, if we can not.

Czech
DO NOT SIT DOWN TOO SOON

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned about the apparent urgency on the part of the Executive to resume negotiations with the Russians at the leadership level. In view of the recent brutal takeover of Czechoslovakia by the U.S.S.R., it does seem to me that the sensibilities of the world, a healthy skepticism about the value of Russian promises and an unwillingness to treat the Soviets as normally functioning members of the international community should make us extremely cautious at this time about hurrying into any negotiations at the top level.

Accordingly, I have sent a letter to President Johnson in which I expressed my reservations about taking any such precipitate Executive action.

For the information of my colleagues, I am including this letter after these remarks:

September 4, 1968.

THE PRESIDENT
The White House
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing this letter to urge that no top level U.S.-Russian diplomatic meeting be held at the present time.

You have previously indicated a desire to meet with Premier Kosygin in order to fur-

ther the cause of international peace and all would agree that this is a worthy objective. I applaud your desire, even at the close of your term, to seek to achieve progress in the area of world peace. At this time, however, I feel strongly that such a meeting would be inadvisable and I am communicating with you because there has been no indication that the proposed meeting has been removed from your agenda.

In other times this meeting would be proper and probably desirable but the Russian policy (whether a reversion or simply a continuation of basic philosophy) revealed by the Czech crisis has totally changed the international atmosphere and requires a revision of our thinking in U.S.-U.S.S.R. relations.

While I agree that the problem of peace does not disappear with the Czech crisis and that we must continue to work for this objective, I do believe that the character of our efforts and their timing must be altered in response to the changed world power situation.

At the moment few people are prepared to rely on any Russian agreement. These include Americans, Europeans, Asians, Communist Party members and particularly the people of Eastern Europe.

The Communist movement of the West has been shaken to its eye teeth by the action of the Soviet leadership and the hollowness of the Soviet's words comes through loud and clear in the Moscow agreement which states that the Soviets and the satellites will cooperate with the Czechs "on the basis of mutual respect, equality, territorial integrity, independence and solidarity." Also, in the last few days with the takeover of the communications media and the entry of the secret police in large numbers to man the Czech ministries and pick off the liberals, a particularly revolting phase of Russian conduct has begun.

A meeting between yourself and Premier Kosygin would enhance present Soviet leadership in the eyes of their people and possibly others, even though the Russians have committed a wanton criminal act and their putsch is still in progress. A meeting at this time would take place also in the light of Vietnam and its daily reminders, the lack of resolution of the Pueblo affair and the absence of achievement in the present negotiations on such matters. It would also occur in the face of the gradual escalation of the Russian war effort in supplying arms to North Vietnam which radically changed the character of the conflict of that police action and has been the largest single factor in preventing the United States from successfully ending that conflict. This is the same leadership that has been responsible for the tremendous Egyptian arms build up, both before and after the June war against Israel and which has moved into the Eastern Mediterranean and now seeks to enter the Persian Gulf.

I do want to make it clear that I would in no way suspend meetings at the Secretary of State level or the level of the Geneva disarmament talks or at any other appropriate lower level. I do suggest, however, that at this time excessive haste in seeking to resume negotiations would tend to solidify the Soviet position and would leave the United States open to the charge of showing a callous disregard for the criminal suppression of the liberties of the Czech people.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

RAMSEY CLARK—A SUPERIOR ATTORNEY GENERAL

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Ramsey Clark has proven to be one of the Nation's most effective Attorneys General.

His outstanding record rebuts criticism from some political sources.

This was pointed out in a recent column by Dana Bullen, a syndicated columnist and reporter for the Washington Evening Star.

I submit the entire column, from the August 23 Evening Star, for publication in the RECORD:

RAMSEY CLARK HITS BACK AT CRITICS

(By Dana Bullen)

Whether he likes it or not, Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark is playing an increasingly important political role this election year.

As the country's top law enforcement official, the 40-year-old attorney general is the natural target for Republican charges that the Johnson-Humphrey team has dropped the ball on emotional "law and order" issues.

At the same time, his job makes Clark the logical member of the administration to rebut such criticism.

What has developed is a pattern that may be repeated many times before the votes are counted in November.

In Miami Beach, for example, GOP presidential candidate Richard M. Nixon won thunderous applause two weeks ago when he promised appointment of a new attorney general "to restore order and respect for law in this country."

A few days later, Clark sat down with reporters at a Justice Department luncheon. The occasion was billed as informal, but it was clear that the attorney general would respond to Nixon's statements if he were asked about them.

By the time the session was over, Clark had delivered what amounted to a Justice Department position paper on just about every issue Nixon had raised—plus a few the GOP candidate had overlooked.

Accusing Nixon of dodging specific crime issues, such as gun controls and aid for local police, Clark said he considered it more important for the public to know what Nixon was for, not who he was against.

"One of the great tragedies of our time is the way we have neglected law enforcement," said Clark.

"We have underpaid them. We have undertrained them. We have understaffed them. And now we wonder why we have been unable to prevent crime to a greater degree," he said.

The next day, at another gathering, Clark answered those who have backed police authority to shoot looters.

One of those who has said officers should be allowed to shoot, at least if a looter tries to run, is the GOP vice presidential candidate, Maryland Gov. Spiro T. Agnew.

"We have heard much loose talk of shooting looters. This talk has got to stop," Clark said.

"No civilized nation in history has sanctioned summarily shooting thieves caught in the commission of their crime," he said. "Will America be the first?"

In such statements, Clark appears less interested in answering specific GOP criticism than in setting the record straight. Of necessity, though, his statements on controversial law enforcement issues have political impact.

For many months, the attorney general has been taking stands that now assume a partisan significance. Gun controls, aid for local law enforcement, steps to curb juvenile delinquency, more money for corrections programs and similar things have been priority administration goals for a long time.

As the campaign heats up, they have become the issues of partisan politics as well.

Clark does not shy away from discussion of such issues. It may even be that he welcomes a new chance to express what, for him, have been continuing objectives.

Criticized as "soft" on crime, he also may welcome the chance to set out the specifics of the Justice Department's record. They rebut such criticisms.

The number of criminal prosecutions—and the number of convictions—is up. The number of fugitives apprehended by the FBI is at a record high. Organized crime efforts today make the number of cases brought during the last year of the Eisenhower administration seem puny.

At the same time, the Justice Department has quietly been building an impressive record of steps to press for civil rights, school desegregation, job opportunities and the like.

During fiscal 1968, for example, 23 suits were brought under equal employment sections of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Motions were filed to require 159 school districts to replace "freedom of choice" plans. The first suits involving northern schools and voting rights in the North also have been filed.

Over-all, then, the Justice Department can answer criticisms that might come from either conservative or liberal sources.

It is a comfortable position to be in an election year.

The problem, however, is getting the message out. It is here that Clark finds that he must depart from his basic desire to keep the Justice Department completely out of politics.

When charges involving crime, riots and the Justice Department are made, he will answer them.

Some observers feel that a slight change in rhetoric would permit Clark to assume a tough, crime-fighter stance that would endear him to those who now criticize him.

Events may force him closer to such a stance.

So far, though, Clark has stuck to the same approach he has demonstrated in less partisan times. It is that effective law enforcement is possible without taking shortcuts.

In fact, he long has wondered—sometimes aloud—why some people think it is being soft on crime to stand for adequate resources for police, courts and corrections programs.

HOWARD CHESTER ADDRESSES OKLAHOMA LABOR DAY BANQUET

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, Howard Chester, chairman of the Stone, Glass, and Clay Coordinating Committee, gave a thoughtful and effective speech at the annual Labor Day celebration in Henryetta, Okla. Mr. Chester, one of the glass industry's best informed leaders, has devoted a large proportion of his time and considerable talent to the subject of the impact of imports on the stone, glass, and clay industries in the United States. His balanced and well reasoned presentation on this subject is one that should be read by all concerned Americans.

The speech follows:

Mr. Chairman, Eastern Oklahoma Labor Day Committee Members, Senator Monroney, Congressman Edmondson, trade union officers and members, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

You may ask, what is the Stone, Glass and Clay Coordinating Committee? Our Committee is comprised of seven International Unions who have joined together to

work on problems affecting any one or all of the International Unions affiliated. We have a membership of 250,000 workers, with active locals in almost all of the fifty States. Our affiliated International Unions are as follows:

The American Flint Glass Workers Union of North America; the Glass Bottle Blowers Association of the United States and Canada; the International Brotherhood of Operative Potters; the United Cement, Lime and Gypsum Workers; the United Glass and Ceramic Workers of North America; the United Stone and Allied Products Workers of America; and my home union, the Window Glass Cutters League of America. The Chairman of our Committee is Mr. Lee W. Minton, President of the Glass Bottle Blowers Association and our Secretary-Treasurer was Mr. McCracken—I am sorry to say Bro. McCracken passed away August 25—Secretary-Treasurer of the United Glass and Ceramic Workers, the International Presidents are the Executive Board.

In Oklahoma the International Unions have at least one, and in some cases several local unions located in the following communities: Henryetta, Okmulgee, Ada, Sapulpa, Muskogee, Millicreek, Sand Springs, Oklahoma City, Altus, Snyder, Tulsa, Pryor, Duke, Stringtown, and Sallisaw.

So, now that we are all acquainted on this historic day for Labor celebrating the highest dignity—the highest nobility—the dignity of Labor—I would like to speak with you about a subject we are constantly working on and a subject that concerns each and everyone of us here today—the Effect on Labor of U.S. Trade Policy.

All working Americans are affected by United States trade policy; our Nation requires maximum employment and healthy industries to maintain a healthy economy, and without a healthy economy our position as a world power and leader of the free world will quickly deteriorate, and just as quickly be replaced by another country less generous than the United States.

The American people have for many years been misled, with regard to our balance of trade figures, into believing the United States has been enjoying large surpluses in our trade account, when in fact we are not. If we valued our imports as most countries do, on a CIF basis, our import valuations would increase by ten to twenty percent.

For example, based on Department of Commerce figures exports for 1967 were estimated \$31 billion and imports \$26.7 billion. Adding 10 percent—a conservative figure—to imports for CIF valuation, this figure becomes \$29.37 billion, and our balance of trade figure quoted at \$4.3 billion drops to \$1.93 billion, a sharp drop of \$2.37 billion. Of course many countries use in excess of 10 percent to add the CIF valuation, and to report their imports.

Also, we overvalue our exports by including Government subsidies within our export figures. In order to find the true figures of our exports that move in commercial competition or for dollar sales we must know the breakdown of the subsidized products and shipping costs paid for by the U.S. Government.

Reporting imports on a CIF basis, withdrawing Government subsidies when reporting agricultural exports, would give a true picture of our balance of trade, several billion dollars less each year than the reported figures, and in many, many cases would have resulted in a deficit in our trade account.

Accurate and realistic trade statistics on our imports and exports would make possible more responsible and responsive decisions on our Nation's foreign trade policy. It is imperative for the Congress to have the accurate facts at their disposal so they can regulate foreign commerce and preserve this Nation's economic well-being.

U.S. foreign investment—and, as a sub-

stantial part of this category, U.S. private foreign investment—must be given full consideration as an inseparable part of our foreign trade policy.

American jobs are being exported to other countries by the astounding increase in U.S. private foreign investment. Increasing from a 1950 figure of \$19 billion to a 1966 figure of \$86 billion or a 454 percent increase, using American investment plus foreign labor to produce products for sale within the foreign market and for export to the United States, displacing American labor, and yet expecting American workers to purchase products that are putting them out of work and destroying job potential.

In 1965, U.S. foreign affiliates exported products back to the U.S. totaling \$5 billion, in manufactured products, mining products, and petroleum and petroleum products. These exports flow from private direct foreign investment of \$54.5 billion, as of the end of 1960, located primarily in Canada and Western Europe.

Many of these global corporations are showing their concern against any restriction to their access to the U.S. market. They recognize that free access to U.S. markets is in their corporation interest; they want to invest abroad, enjoy the markets and low-wage labor; and they also want to enjoy the U.S. market from abroad, in some cases in direct competition with their domestic operation or other domestic producers of the same products.

The time has come for a re-evaluation of this expanded investment program in terms of the U.S. economy, employment, outflow of capital, loss of revenue to the United States and effect of imports on U.S. industry and labor.

Our rising deficit in our balance of payments has brought this problem into focus and President Johnson wisely issued mandatory restrictions on private foreign investment as of January 1, 1968.

The adjustment assistance section of the Trade Expansion Act, providing for assistance to firms and workers injured by imports, has proven worthless, negated by the addition of the words "in major part." As a result there has not been a single case with an affirmative finding by the Tariff Commission since enactment of the law in 1962. A workable and effective adjustment assistance program was vitally important to Labor, in fact as AFL-CIO President Mr. George Meany testified, "It is indispensable to our support of the trade program as a whole." Of course there is no substitute for a job and a productive place in our society.

Immediate action to halt job losses due to our trade policies would be in our Nation's interest, and corrective measures should be taken, in conjunction with existing aid proposed Government programs, to help our unemployed, and to put a stop to the dangerous erosion of U.S. employment due to the rising tide of foreign imports.

Those of you here today know what rising imports are doing to your jobs—with people laid off—working part time—for example in the flat glass industry, and two plants are located here in Eastern Oklahoma, at Henryetta and Okmulgee. Imports of flat glass in one year displaces 7,000 workers—without imports 7,000 more people could be hired throughout the industry. Cement, Lime, Gypsum, and Stone products are suffering from imports and dumping of these products into the U.S. Tableware and cookware, bottles and other glass containers—all of these products which are being produced by members of Unions affiliated with the Stone, Glass and Clay Coordinating Committee are being seriously affected by rising imports. We need legislation to regulate imports; other countries impose quotas, border taxes, value taxes to protect their industries from imports—why shouldn't we?

We have brought these facts to the attention of Congressional Committees, the De-